

Application No. 10/786,777
Attorney Docket No. 213187-00008

REMARKS

Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1-5 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out the invention. The Applicant notes with appreciation the acceptance of the drawings.¹ Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. It is respectfully submitted that upon entry of the amendment and consideration of the remarks below that the application is in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,198,833 ("the Rangan et al patent"). It is respectfully submitted that the Rangan, et al. patent does not disclose from the invention, as recited in amended claim 1. In particular, claims 1-5 recite an image processing system which includes a video linking system which generates one or more linked video files which are separate from the video content. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has mischaracterized the Rangan et al patent. Perhaps the easiest way to explain the differences is during playback. In particular, in the present system, playback of the claimed linked video files will not display the video content since the linked video files are totally separate from the video content. The Rangan et al patent teaches a system in which the data stream is combined with the video stream for playback ("As previously described with reference to Fig. 1, this output (*combining both streams*) is directed back to be viewed." Rangan et al patent Col. 10, lines 57 and 58). Thus, even though the Rangan et al patent teaches that a separate data stream is created, that data stream is combined with the video content data stream for playback. As a result, the system disclosed in the Rangan et al patent raises issues that are non-existent with the claimed system. Probably the most important difference is that copyright owners of the video content view the process of combining the data

¹ Paragraphs 1 and 10 of Office Action Summary refer to Feb. 25, 2004, which is the filing date of the Application. The Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant to refer to the date of the last response, which was January 13, 2006. The Applicant would appreciate a confirmation of this point as well as a confirmation that the substitute specification, included with that response, has been accepted and entered.

Application No. 10/786,777
Attorney Docket No. 213187-00008

stream with the video content data stream as an alteration of video content and perhaps the video quality and for copyrighted video content are not likely to permit it. The claimed system allows playback of the original video content independent of the data stream. As such, for copyrighted video content, the copyright owners are more likely to permit it. For all of the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rangan, et al. patent, further in view of the Vidovic, U.S. Patent No. 3,878,557. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent upon claim 1. The Rangan, et al. patent has already been discussed. The Vidovic patent was cited for teaching a videotape recording apparatus which shows color frame pulses separated by 66 millohertz. The Vidovic patent otherwise does not disclose or suggest a video linking system which generates video linking files which are separate from the video content as recited in the claims at issue. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rangan, et al. patent in view of Toklu, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,643. Claims 4 and 5 are also dependent upon claim 1. The Rangan, et al. patent has been discussed above. The Toklu patent was cited for teaching video summarization methods, but does not otherwise disclose a video linking system which generates linked video files which identify the frame and location within

Application No. 10/786,777
Attorney Docket No. 213187-00008

the frame of selectable pixel objects within each frame. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By: 
John S. Paniagras
Registration No. 31,051
Attorney for Applicant(s)

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
525 W. Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693
Telephone: (312) 902-5200
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061